

Communion.

I have been thinking a great deal upon this subject, and as it has been discussed pro and con in our paper, I have carefully examined the arguments advanced on both sides. Scripture and not prejudice should enter into a fair and honest discussion upon this important question.

I do confess that the arguments of the champions of Open Communion looks fair and reasonable, from their standpoint; that is worshiping with other denominations, calling upon them to pray, praying with them when called upon to pray, etc. I think that we can do that and be consistent at the same time we are commanded to pray without ceasing, and our Savior prayed without regard to place or opportunity, only governed by necessity. We know that all Christian churches have conditions upon which they admit or invite persons to the Lord's table, and hold that baptism is a necessary pre-requisite. We do not all agree upon the same mode of baptism. The Baptists say that the immersion of a believer backward is the proper mode; the Presbyterians say sprinkling or pouring and the Methodists say that either is baptism. Now what does the Brethren church say? The immersion of a believer three times face forward, only, constitutes baptism and they will not receive any one into the church unless they have been so baptized.

I see that the advocates of Open Communion quote 1 Cor. 11: 28. But let a man examine himself and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup. Yet restricted communion is passing judgment. I for one say we have no right to judge who are qualified to approach the Lord's table. They tell us, judge not that ye be not judged; but at the same time Open Communionists think themselves perfectly competent to judge who should approach the Lord's table. It is true we are forbidden to judge the hearts or motives of our brethren, but we are authorized by the word of God to know them by their fruits and thus decide who are church members. We have the authority of the apostles by which we are to judge with whom we should eat at the Lord's table. 1 Cor. 5: 11, 13. But now I have written unto you not to keep company if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator or covetous or an idolator or a railer or a drunkard or an extortioner; with such a one no not to eat; for what have I to do to judge them also that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? Now here is the authority of heaven to judge them that are within the church or decide who are members of the church and qualified to approach the Lord's table. If now Open Communion is right, all must eat with us at the Lord's table who think themselves worthy then we must eat with all those classes of persons with whom the apostle said, no not to eat. If we wish to bring 1 Cor. 11: 28, to the light, we must note the connection in which it was used and the characters to whom it was addressed. It was not addressed to the unbaptized who were not church members, but to the church of God which is at Corinth. 1 Cor. 1: 2. This instruction for church members to examine themselves is the same given by every minister of the Brethren church who administers the Lord's Supper. They exhort every member to examine himself or herself in the light of the word of God with humble prayer and supplication to God to enable them to partake of the elements with due solemnity in memory of a dying Savior. The fault of some of those Corinthians in 11: 21, was that in eating every one taketh before other his own supper and one is hungry and another is drunken, and when the apostle had sharply rebuked them for their want of reverence in partaking of the supper, he then exhorted them, the actual church members, to examine themselves and so eat of that bread and drink of that cup.

Another objection urged by the advocates of Open Communion is that restricted communion exhibits a want of charity or want of love toward our Brethren, whom we do admit to be pious persons. Now we read in 1 Peter 4: 8, that though charity shall cover a multitude of sins and faults, we also read in 1 Cor. 13: 6, that it rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth. Does this not teach us that our charity or love for man should not cause us to violate the truth of God? For if

we love Jesus Christ we must keep his commandments, irrespective of the views, feelings, prejudices or traditions of men. If our love or charity for men should induce us to violate the laws of Christ, which we would do if we commune with those who are neither baptized nor members of the kingdom of Christ. It would be self-evident that we are not worthy of him.

It appears to me that the advocates of Open Communion are more anxious to show their love for their fellow-man than to Jesus Christ by the faithful observance of his commandments. It is evident that we exhibit more love for erring Brethren by refusing to indorse their errors; viz, to commune with them, participating with them in church ordinance and also confirming them in an error, which would be paramount to permanent injury. Their objection is made on a misconception of the design of the Lord's supper when they charge us with the want of love toward them by not communing with them. They show by that act they regard it as a kind of lovefeast to show love for each other instead of in the memory of a dying Savior. It is a Christian's duty to love his wife his children and his neighbor; but is it his duty to commune with them at the Lord's table irrespective of any preparation on their part to show that love by keeping the commandments of the Savior? We are commanded by our Savior to love our enemies who despitefully use and persecute us, but must we commune with them to show our love for them? We are commanded to love our wives children, neighbors, enemies, friends and Pedo-Baptists, yet we must love our Savior more. Therefore we must not break the least of all of his commandments or teach others to do so by communing with them when we are confident that they have not yielded obedience to the terms of admission to the supper. The question is asked if we can not commune here on earth together how can we commune together in heaven? We answer that the Lord's Supper is an institution belonging to the churches in the kingdom of Christ, on earth and it is only to be observed till Christ comes again; therefore it will not be observed in heaven.

If they mean spiritual communion we answer, we now have such communion with all the people of God on earth; and then it is urged that we exclude persons from communion with whom we expect to live in heaven and do therefore regard the Lord's Supper more holy than heaven itself. We answer, do not the advocates of Open Communion also exclude persons with whom they expect to live in heaven. Therefore Open Communion is more holy than heaven. You exclude children. Our Savior says, of such is the kingdom of heaven. We read in Luke 22: 29, 30, Jesus says, I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father has appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Here we are informed that the disciples must eat and drink at his table in his kingdom.

Now I ask is the table spread in the Burmish church, Universalist or Mormon church? Is it the Lord's table? Are they in the kingdom of Christ? The Lord's Supper is restricted to the kingdom of Christ and all the children of God are invited to participate at the Lord's table in the kingdom of Christ. They should not be invited to approach the table in the neglect or contempt for the laws of Christ. Every one must get into the kingdom in the proper way before he approaches the table. The table is fixed in the kingdom. Our Savior says in Mark 7: 7. In vain do they worship me teaching for doctrine the commandments of men, and Paul says, Col. 2: 21, 23, touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using after the commandments and doctrines of men, which things indeed have a show of wisdom in, will-worship and humility, and neglecting of the body not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh. By Open Communion we touch, taste, handle and indorse the church which holds them. Does John recommend this mixed communion? No; he says, 2 John 10: 14, if there come any to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds. John says receive him not.

In answer to an article which appeared in No. 37, let me say, the action of our Lord is referred to in washing the feet of Judas and probably administering to him the communion and associating with him as with the other apostles, and enjoyed every privilege but the Lord's confidence. While this is true, it is also true that our Lord chose him as one of the apostles, when he knew what was in the heart of Judas. Yet he does not commission his disciples to choose one who has a devil, but he says, go ye therefore into all the ends of the earth and preach my Gospel. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.

DANIEL HENRICKS.

Maxville, Ohio.

Pastor and People.

"All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient." Paul does not mean to convey the idea that it is lawful to do wrong; no, never. The idea in the mind of the apostle is that there may be times when it would not be expedient to speak or write on certain subjects that are lawful, while at other times it would be expedient and very edifying. We therefore believe that a few thoughts will now be in season. The salaried ministry subject has been somewhat discussed through the EVANGELIST. Salaried ministry may accomplish much good and it may be abused and accomplish much harm. The one and only thought of the pastor and minister should be the salvation of souls and the building up of the cause. We believe many pastors understand their duty; but may not the laity neglect their duty and thereby hinder the development of much good. The pastor's mind should not be engaged in making money. That belongs to the laity to supply. The laborer is worthy his hire. His time should be given in administering about holy things. The pastor surely needs our prayers, our kind words, our good council, our devoted Christian lives. Then the members of his charge should occasionally visit him unitedly in love and good deeds and whatever you find him in need of supply that want. It may be in papers or books, it may be in food or raiment. And there is his family-many hours he spends in solitary study while the laity have their pleasant, social chat. Sisters, kind deeds are becoming at your hands and there are the children. I wonder if sometimes they don't wish their papa was not a minister so that he could give them some needed presents. So we should add all the needed encouragement, and so bare one another's burdens. God bless the Brethren cause everywhere.

JONATHAN WARNER.

Morrill, Kan.

Good works do not make a Christian, for one must be a Christian to do good works. The tree bringeth forth the fruit, not the fruit the tree. None is made a Christian by works, but by Christ, and being in Christ he brings forth fruit to him.—Luther.

The fact is that a certain class of men love to be quiet and are ready to sell their country to the evil one himself, that they may live at ease and make no enemies. They have not the manliness to plead for the right, for it might cost them a customer or a friend; and so they plead a superior holiness as an excuse for skulking.—Spurgeon.

OUR DEAD.

DAVIS—Barbara Davis died at her home in Donegal township, Westmoreland county, Pa., on Tuesday October 19th, aged 75 years, 4 months and one day. She was a member of the Evangelical church for over fifty years. Her funeral was largely attended especially by the aged persons of the neighborhood. Her maiden name was Barbara King. She was born and raised in Cambria county, Pa. The funeral sermon was preached by brother Baumgardner, the regular pastor at this place.

On Saturday 23rd a little daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Stout, passed away, also, old Mrs. Grove aged about 80 years. Both were buried on Monday 25th.

MARRIED.

MYERS-WOLF.—At the residence of the bride's parents, six miles south of Lathrop, Oct. 12th 1886, by the undersigned, Brother F. A. Myers, of Lathrop, and sister R. Amanda Wolf, all of San Joaquin county, Cal. May their journey through life be pleasant as the day of their marriage. J. W. BEER.

MUSSER-SAYLOR.—At the residence of the officiating minister in Berlin Congregation, Somerset county, Pa., on Oct. 26, 1886, by Rev. John H. Knepper, Bro. Jacob Musser, of Berlin, Pa., and sister Elizabeth Saylor, of Falls City, Neb. May the blessings of heaven follow them through life, and in death may they be crowned with life everlasting is the prayer of their pastor.